

## REMARKS

All grounds for objection have been addressed and corrected

Claims 16 through 26 were indicated in the Office Action of October 3, 2007 to contain allowable subject matter. These and also Claims 10 – 27, 33 and 34 were objected to because of certain informalities.

Specifically in each independent claim CYP450RAI is now defined as cytochrome P450 retinoic acid inducible (CYP450RAI) enzyme. Support for exactly this definition is found in the second paragraph of page 3 of the specification.

The other perceived informality was cured by amendment of the formulas based on the following guiding principle. Where a variable, such as “R” in Claim 10 and elsewhere was shown in the structural formula without a formally drawn bond, there in the definition of the variable a bond symbolized by “-“ was added. Where the variable, such as “Y” or “Z” in Claim 16 and elsewhere was shown in the structural formula attached by a bond or bonds to the remainder of the structure, there a formal “-“ was deleted from the definition of the variable. Applicant emphasizes that the all of the foregoing is merely correction of alleged informalities and that absolutely no substantive change in the scope or meaning of the claims is intended by the above-described changes.

The rejection of Claims 33 and 34 for indefiniteness is overcome by the present amendment of these claims

Claims 33 and 34 were rejected on the grounds that the definition of the variable “R” was merely functional and indefinite. Without conceding the foregoing applicant has now amended Claim 33 in a manner that overcomes this alleged ground of indefiniteness,

The first structural formula of Claim 33 is an ester formed from Vitamin A serving as the “alcohol” and a compound serving as the carboxylic acid that forms the ester. This carboxylic acid is now defined by structural formula as the “radical” of the compounds of the invention and claimed *inter alia* in Claims 10 and 16 as a carboxylic acid (in the case when R = H in these claims). The compounds of Claims 10 and 16 are demonstrated to be inhibitors of the CYP450RAI enzyme. Therefore, instant Claim 33 now replaces a more general definition of CYP450RAI inhibitors with certain specific inhibitors disclosed in the specification. In light of the foregoing, claims 33 and 34 are fully supported by the specification and are in *prima facie* patentable condition.

The rejection of Claims 10 – 15 for obviousness is respectfully submitted to be in error

Claims 10 – 15 were rejected as defining subject matter that was deemed obvious over a combination of Us Patent Nos. 6,369,261 (*Johnson et al.*) and *Van Scott et al.* However, Claims 10-15 are drawn to methods using compounds in co-administration with Vitamin A and retinoic acid which compounds are neither disclosed nor structurally suggested by these two references. Therefore, these claims are not obvious over the cited references. In the event the Examiner maintains the view that the compounds defined in independent Claim 10 are structurally obvious over either of the two cited references, the applicant respectfully request the Examiner to specifically point out the structure or structures in the reference(s) that would, in the Examiner’s view, render the compound(s) obvious to be used in the claimed method.

In the event the Examiner is of the opinion that a telephone conference with the undersigned attorney would materially facilitate the

final disposition of this case, she is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted

By:

*Gabor L. Szekeres*  
***Gabor L. Szekeres***

Registration Number 28,675

P.O. Box 27938  
Anaheim Hills, CA 92809  
Tel: 714 944 5778  
Fax: 714 639 4961